



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A great deal of ingenuity has recently been devoted to proving that Roman civilization and the Latin language are the source of very much in our modern life. The close kinship of Rome to the modern world has been appealed to as a motive for studying Latin. The question arises whether there is a similar argument for the study of Greek. I think there is. The most valuable part of the civilization which Rome passed on to the modern world came from Greece. Is it not better to study the origin of European civilization and the period of its most rapid development than to study the first stage of the great decline which began with Rome and continued through the Middle Ages? Our world is more nearly akin to ancient Greece than to Rome or in fact to any other place and time in all history.

Then what can we do about it? I have three suggestions.

(1) The reason usually given for the elimination of Greek from the High Schools is that small classes are too expensive. I do not see any immediate way of meeting this argument in small High Schools. But in Schools with three or more sections in first year Latin it should be possible to have one of the sections begin Greek instead of Latin. This would involve no extra expense if one third of the students elected to study Greek. The success of the plan, then, would depend on the persuasive powers of the principal and the head of the classical department. I should say, however, that any teacher could persuade one student out of three to take Greek instead of Latin.

(2) Many Colleges require Latin for entrance but no Greek. Some of these allow the substitution of Greek for Latin, but others do not. As long as no students apply for entrance with Greek and without Latin, this makes little difference, except that it tends to perpetuate the present neglect of Greek in the High Schools. It is to be hoped that no College will refuse to accept entrance Greek in place of entrance Latin when it is offered. Provision for such cases should be made as soon as possible.

(3) The argument advanced above as to High School students applies equally to College freshmen. We are more likely to hold a man for classical study if we put him at Greek as soon as he enters College than if we give him an additional year of Latin. If possible we should have him study both Greek and Latin; but if a choice has to be made Greek should always be preferred. Even if a student enters College with four years of Latin and no Greek, it is better for him to begin Greek than to continue Latin for another year. If he gets a fair start with his Greek he will probably elect some Latin before he leaves College; but if he takes freshman Latin and no Greek, the chances are that he will drop classical study at the end of the freshman or, at most, the sophomore year.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

REVIEWS

A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy. By Evelyn Spring. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 28.135-224. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (1917).

It is unfortunate that Miss Spring chose the present title for this essay, which was originally called *Quo Modo Aeschylus in Tragoediis Suis Res Antecedentis Exposuerit*, since the latter title is far more suggestive of the content of the work. Also, the opening sentences cause one to fear that Miss Spring does not always differentiate exposition and the development of the plot by unveiling the past. She says (135):

Exposition is that part of dramatic construction which deals with the unfolding of the plot. Every dramatist must provide sufficient elucidation of the past to render intelligible the ever-advancing action of the present. He may complete the necessary explanation in a few lines, or he may continue to enlighten his audience throughout the play, by revealing various circumstances that are antecedent to the action of the drama proper at the moment when the announcement of each is dramatically most effective.

The meaning of the first statement is rendered obscure, if not incorrect, by the fact that the phrase "unfolding of the plot" usually means the development of the plot or action; whereas exposition is the explanation, for the sake of the audience, of the events which lead to the unfolding of the plot. While the author may continue to enlighten his audience throughout the play, the revelation of "various circumstances that are antecedent to the drama proper at the moment when the announcement of each is dramatically most effective" is not necessarily exposition. If it were, the revelation that Oedipus is the murderer of Laius would be exposition, and so, likewise, would be the dénouement of most Latin comedies. This fundamental error actually results in Miss Spring doing herself an injustice. For instance, under the heading, *The Gradual Exposition of the Past*, she shows in an excellent manner the dramatic value of the gradual unveiling of the past for purposes of characterization, dramatic irony, etc. (189-199); but she calls this procedure, at times, the gradual method of exposition and distributive exposition, although she tacitly proves that it is not exposition. At other times, she recognizes the difference, for she points out that lines 227-247 of the choral ode in the *Agamemnon*, dealing with the death of Iphigenia, are not primarily expository in character, but furnish "the foundation for Clytaemnestra's later defence of her crime" (205). Thus, if the reader keeps in mind that the purpose of Miss Spring's study is to show how Aeschylus unveiled the past, and realizes that she uses the term exposition in a rather loose way, he will find many interesting pages in the essay; but the reader will be disappointed if the present title leads him to expect an account of the development of the art of exposition in relation to the point of attack in all Greek tragedy.

Miss Spring discusses the plays of Aeschylus in greater detail than those of Sophocles and Euripides in order to emphasize the excellence of the Aeschylean technique. She holds (137) that Aeschylus was not only more interested in the technical problems than either Sophocles or Euripides, but, as far as exposition is concerned, he was more successful in dramatic construction.

We must say that it hardly seems possible to form any judgment in regard to the amount of interest in technical details felt by each of the dramatists. In regard to the success of Aeschylus in the matter of exposition, if by exposition is meant the explanation of the situation necessary to understand the development of the play, the present writer agrees that Aeschylus is shown to be clear, and the element of clearness is most important. However, if Miss Spring refers to the unveiling of the past as a means of causing the action to develop, it must be said that the Oedipus Tyrannus is a finer play in this respect than the Agamemnon, which Miss Spring says (187),

more than any other extant play of Aeschylus, reveals the advantages of the distributive mode of explication for purposes of suspense and climax.

But, after all, most of the action in the Agamemnon depends upon present conditions and events, whereas almost all the action in the Oedipus Tyrannus depends upon the disclosure of the past, and the manner in which Sophocles overcame the difficulties which beset him is little short of marvellous. Thus we cannot agree with Miss Spring in her view that Sophocles was very careless in not explaining in the Oedipus Tyrannus why the man who witnessed the murder of Laius is reported to have said that Laius was slain by robbers. Sophocles undoubtedly followed the excellent procedure of all dramatists, who, when they cannot offer a good explanation for an element in the plot, offer no explanation. His suppression of this detail of the past shows keen judgment. Only the critic, not the spectator, objects.

Miss Spring deals first with the elucidation of the past in the trilogy, showing that Aeschylus did not think of each play as unrelated to the others, although (155)

he was careful to make each play an intelligible dramatic entity without reference to the others of the group. He further provided in each a summary or summaries of preceding dramas.

It is also shown how each play prepares for the future events in following plays. These conclusions drawn from the Orestia are confirmed by an examination of other connected groups of plays.

The discussion of the elucidation of the past in the parados or prologue is then taken up, and it is found (181) that

the situation at the beginning of all the extant plays of Aeschylus is clear, provided that it is admitted that the poet presupposed a general knowledge of the myths that he used as foundation for his plot.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the essay is that in which Miss Spring shows in detail the amount of pre-knowledge on the part of the audience assumed by the playwright. Professor Post's view that the spectator's acquaintance with the myth was a disadvantage to the dramatist is successfully refuted¹.

The reason for the repetition of expository details is found to be, in part, the necessity of acquainting the chorus or certain characters with facts already brought out before their entrance. We must insist, however, that such repetition as Miss Spring describes on page 188 is not always for the benefit of the audience. If the spectator already knows a fact brought out in some scene, to inform a character of that fact is not exposition but is a means of developing the action. Miss Spring finds a general explanation of this practice in the peculiar structure of Greek tragedy, which, being "concerned only with the results of a great calamity. . . , must deal exclusively with the past" (188). But to repeat information for the benefit of the audience or for any other purpose is not peculiar to Greek tragedy any more than it is to drama which deals exclusively with the present. All dramatists repeat certain details, sometimes for exposition, and sometimes to advance the plot. It would be impossible to write a play or to have it understood by the audience without repetition and even insistence on certain points. The fact that Greek drama deals with the past makes it necessary to unveil the past; but it does not make repetition of the unveiling necessary. Repetition in all drama is due to other causes set forth by Mr. Clayton Hamilton in the chapter of his book to which Miss Spring refers on page 187; and better reasons are to be found in that chapter than those to which she refers.

In the selection of expository details (210 ff.), Miss Spring believes that Aeschylus, of whom alone it was characteristic to neglect details of minor importance, was governed in his selection by the aim to emphasize only those points which would make his plays successful from a dramatic point of view, and not in order to indulge in an ingenious manipulation of an old plot or in subtle characterization. He also differs from Sophocles and Euripides in that he handled the exposition in such a way as to give a problematical aspect to the past. This part of Miss Spring's work is very convincing; but we cannot agree with her in her criticism of Sophocles for failing to suppress the announcement of the death penalty in the first scene of the Antigone (199 f.). She holds that Sophocles here, as usual, subordinated the principal of suspense to his supreme interest in characterization, and that a poet whose energies were primarily directed toward effective dramatic construction would have kept the audience in ignorance of the penalty until line 460. But exactly the opposite is true. If we did not know the specific penalty attached to the burial of Polynices,

¹Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 16 (1905), 15-61.

our interest and our suspense would be immeasurably decreased. There would simply be a shock of surprise were the announcement made at line 460, and every dramatist knows that only in the rarest cases, and certainly not in this one, must suspense be sacrificed to surprise. The opening scene of the *Antigone* is a model of exposition for reasons of artistic technique which Miss Spring fails to discuss at any time.

We may say, in passing, that we cannot agree with the view that much of the exposition in Greek tragedy, such as information as to the personnel of the chorus, the place of the action and the point of attack, could be dispensed with in a modern play, because it would already have been communicated to the spectators in the program (169). That modern playwrights do not dispense with such exposition is proof that they do not trust the audience to memorize these details from the program.

Miss Spring's contention that "Sophocles, like Scribe, disposed of many necessary explanations early in his plays", and that "Euripides rarely resorted to gradual elucidation" is valid (200). She also shows that Aeschylus used the gradual method of disclosing antecedent conditions more than did Sophocles (191). Beyond the explanation of the Sophoclean procedure, as she believes she sees it exemplified in the *Antigone*, no reason is offered for the different practice on the part of the later playwrights. We venture the theory that this difference is due to the gradual recession of the point of attack away from the dénouement—a phenomenon which can be traced with no little exactitude from the earliest to the latest extant Greek tragedies. Miss Spring is apparently unaware of the steps in this extremely important development in the structure of tragedy, although she compares the point of attack of modern plays with that of Greek plays (166, 188 ff.), and is fully cognizant of the fact that "every Greek tragedy is, to a greater or less degree, a backward-written drama" (203). Now the tragedies of Aeschylus are "backward-written" to a far greater degree than are those of Sophocles or Euripides, because the Aeschylean point of attack is closer to the dénouement than is that of the later dramatists. There are more events and greater development of the plot in the average play of the later playwrights than are included in the scope of an Aeschylean tragedy. Thus, while the point of attack in all three *Electra* plays is apparently the same in point of time, there is a much greater development of plot in the later plays than in the *Choephoroe*. Especially is this true of Sophocles's *Electra*. This is a natural development in dramatic art; and the place of the point of attack is of the utmost importance in the matter of exposition and unveiling the past. Furthermore, the later dramatists discarded the trilogy on one subject, but they have almost as many events and as much action in one play as Aeschylus would have in two or three plays. Therefore, both Sophocles and Euripides had to deal with the present action and events, whereas

Aeschylus not only could but had to hark back to the past more than they did. Thus we cannot admit that the problems of successful exposition must have been baffling when drama was still in its embryonic phase (181). The baffling thing was to introduce action; and, when action was introduced, and when more events in the present had been placed between the point of attack and the dénouement, then exposition became difficult. It is only when the point of attack recedes from the dénouement in order to include events of the past, when it has receded temporarily, so to speak, as in the Shakespearean form of drama, that exposition becomes easy. But, as we have shown in regard to the *Electra* plays, the point of attack remained at the same place in the story, but much more material was introduced by Sophocles and Euripides between the point of attack and the dénouement. Thus they had just as much of the past to explain and much more of the present to deal with. The past, therefore, had to be explained quickly so that the action could develop and attention could be centered on the present and the future. That is the reason why "Sophocles, like Scribe, disposed of many necessary explanations early in his plays". As Miss Spring points out (168), the Greek dramatist was no less handicapped than the modern playwright who plunges *in medias res*, as far as the clear exposition of the past is concerned.

But Miss Spring apparently fails to recognize that there are different degrees of plunging *in medias res*, and that Aeschylus is inclined to plunge *in ultimas res* in his separate plays, as far as development of the plot is concerned, and to allow the action to develop through the trilogy.

Furthermore, these may be the reasons which caused Euripides to surrender to the baffling problem of exposition and write a formal prologue to set forth the necessary facts immediately. Miss Spring does not discuss at any length the Euripidean prologue as a means of exposition. One has to arrive at her estimate of this device by collecting her *obiter dicta* on the subject. She says that she does not know why Euripides chose an undramatic introduction for his plays (186), and that to consider an Euripidean prologue, in general, an essential part of the rest of the play is an injustice to the poet (187). We agree that the expository part of the prologue is not very dramatic, as a rule; but the prologue, taken as a whole with its foreshadowing and the suspense it arouses, is extremely dramatic². Miss Spring holds that the prologue is necessary to understand the *Ion* and the *Bacchae*. But Lessing pointed out long ago that the value of the Euripidean prologue is not to be judged by the question as to whether the play can be understood without it³. Furthermore, Miss Spring makes the statement (181-182) that

²I hope to publish evidence in favor of this view in the near future.

³Hamburgische Dramaturgie, Stücke, 148, 149.

Euripides is perhaps rightly censured for introducing as a speaker of the prologue a character who takes no part in the action of the play after his disappearance at the end of the monologue.

We do not know what Euripidean critics Miss Spring has in mind as having censured Euripides for this practice, but to do so is to censure him for a procedure which he follows only in three of his sixteen plays, counting the Supplices, which has a monologue as an opening scene. This is, therefore, rather meticulous criticism and does not do justice to the poet. In the *Alcestis* and the *Troades* the speaker of the monologue remains for the ensuing dialogue. In the *Medea*, the *Electra*, and the *Supplices*, a secondary character of the play is the speaker. In the *Bacchae*, the *Helen*, the *Andromache*, the *Heracleidae*, the *Hercules Furens*, the *Phoenissae*, the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, and the *Electra* the formal monologue is spoken by a principal character. Only in the *Ion*, the *Hecuba*, and the *Hippolytus* is the procedure found for which Miss Spring would censure the playwright. In the plays of Sophocles, there are only two protatic characters, *Athena* in the *Ajax* and the *Bondwoman* in the *Trachiniae*; and they carry on dialogue with principals. On the other hand, in both of the plays of Aeschylus which open with a monologue, the *Agamemnon* and the *Eumenides*, the speaker of the monologue does not appear again.

These are facts that should have been brought out by Miss Spring, for the effect of expository scenes is greatly altered by the identity and the importance of the characters. Thus the opening of the *Antigone* is much more dramatic with *Antigone* and *Ismene* giving the exposition during a dramatic conflict which constitutes the exciting incident of the plot, than it would be if *Ismene* and a protatic character gave the necessary information in mere narrative dialogue. Miss Spring should also discuss more fully in regard to each dramatist the question as to whether the exposition is, as it were, a mere protatic scene or is combined with an event vital to the plot, as it is in the *Antigone*, or is a striking incident not in strict causal relation to the ensuing action, as in the *Agamemnon*. Thus, while there are many interesting pages in this essay, we cannot say that the study of exposition in Greek tragedy is exhaustive.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

DONALD CLIVE STUART.

Greek Ideals: A Study of Social Life. By C. Delisle Burns. London: G. Bell & Sons (1917). Pp. 275. \$2.

An ever-growing interest in interpretations in English of ancient Hellas is shown by the wide popular appeal made by numerous books which have appeared in the last few years. It seems worth while briefly to mention some of these interpretations, which are intended not so much for the Greek scholar and the Greek student as for the intelligent public. And I am not now thinking so much of the interesting accounts of the astounding results of archaeological excavations in Greece,

in Asia Minor, and in Crete, as, for example, the work of Schliemann, Dörpfeld, Evans, Hawes, and many others¹.

Special studies have been numerous; e.g. for Homer, the books of Lang and of Leaf²; in antiquities (largely private), the brief, but comprehensive, *Life of the Ancient Greeks*, by Gulick (New York, 1903); in education, the books of Capes, Drever, Freeman, and Walden³; in athletics, Gardiner's useful book, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London, 1910)⁴; in economics, Zimmern's valuable work, *The Greek Commonwealth*⁵, Oxford, 1915⁶; in religion, the informative lectures of C. H. Moore, *The Religious Thought of the Greeks* (Cambridge, U. S. A., 1916)⁶; in art and archaeology, Stobart, *The Glory that was Greece* (Philadelphia, 1915)⁷, and Powers's *The Message of Greek Art* (New York, 1915)⁸. Miss Richter's admirable *Guide to the Classical Art Collection in the Metropolitan Museum, New York*, was noticed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 11.200.

For our indebtedness to ancient Greece, there are the stimulating lectures (some of these apply, however, to Russian conditions, primarily) of Zielinski, *Our Debt to Antiquity* (London, 1909), and Mahaffy's disappointing volume with the title which challenges our interest, *What have the Greeks done for Modern Civilization?* (New York, 1910). For the latter book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.220-221.

For those who may be fond of historical fiction, which aims to be reasonably veracious as to the ancient background, there are Gaines's *Gorgo* (Boston, 1903), Davis's *A Victor of Salamis* (New York, 1915), and, with less emphasis on the fictional side, Robinson's *Days of Alkibiades* (New York, 1916)⁹.

Studies in Greek literature have been noteworthy. Still deservedly popular is the work of Symonds¹⁰, *Studies of the Greek Poets*³ (London, 1902). Mackail's *Lectures on Greek Poetry*² (London, 1911) in general show discrimination and excellent taste, but the author is a false guide for Pindar¹¹. Extremely helpful are the Columbia University *Lectures on Greek Literature* (New York, 1912)¹². Valuable interpretations of Euripides are the books of Decharme, Euripides and the Spirit of his Dramas (translated by Loeb; New York, 1906) and Murray, Euripides and his Age (New York, 1913)¹³. Students of English literature will find much information in Collins's *Greek Influence on English Poetry* (London, 1910) and the volume entitled *English Literature and the Classics*, edited by Gordon (Oxford, 1912)¹⁴.

¹Beginning with Tsountas and Manatt, *The Mycenaean Age* (Boston, 1897). Compare also Mosso, *The Palaces of Crete and their Builders* (New York, 1907), reviewed by Dr. Shear in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 1.228-229; Hawes, *Crete, the Forerunner of Greece* (New York, 1909), reviewed by Professor K. K. Smith, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4.166; Baikie, *The Sea-Kings of Crete* (London, 1910), reviewed by Professor K. K. Smith in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4.158-159.

²For a book by Lang, see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4.109-111; for books by Leaf see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.125-126, 10.62-64.

³See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.118.

⁴See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4.100-102.

⁵See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.117-118.

⁶See CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 10.214.

⁷For a review by Professor Robinson see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 11.21-22.

⁸For a review by Professor Robinson see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.29-32.

⁹Reviewed by Professor Jones, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 11.127.

¹⁰Students who admire this lover of Greek poetry will be interested in his biography by Horatio F. Brown² (London, 1903).

¹¹See the review by Professor Shorey, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4.93-95.

¹²Reviewed by Professor Goodell, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.123-124.

¹³For reviews of these books see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 1.5, 8.77-78.

¹⁴Both these books were reviewed by L. R. Van Hook in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8, 125-127.